

Washington, D.C. 20520

OGC SUB J: APPROPRIATIONS

Trasmington, D.O. 10320

June 29, 1973

	SECRET	
	MEMORANDUM	
	TO: EA - Ambassador Godley PM - Mr. Thomas Pickering	
	FROM: L/EA - Elizabeth G. Verville	
	SUBJECT: Funding of	25X6
25X1A	More than two months ago a cable went to our Embassies in and Vientiane informing them that in FY 1974 we will be able to support	25X6
25X6	from FY 1973 MASF (State 65168). The Department of State acquiesced in this view in reliance upon assurances from the Department of Defense General Counsel, Mr. J. Fred Buzhardt, that the appropriate congressional committees agreed to this funding scheme.	23/0
	Upon learning of this cable, this office took the position that the expenditure of MASF funds for the support of support s	25X6
25X6	Since the We have not relied on the legally questionable and politically contentious claim that the CIA may spend funds transferred	25X6

## SECRET

## SECRET

25X6

25X6

25X1

25X6

2 :

from DOD without regard for the limits of DOD's original authority to spend those same funds. Once	
ve do not see how	
we could continue to fit them into the "local forces	
in Inocal purchamiter in reject of the first that there no	25X6
longer will be	23/40
· <u> </u>	
The expenditure of MASF funds to support	25X1
presents no legal difficulty*. However,	
MASF support for the	
for any time longer than a reasonable transition period	
* A subsidiary issue arises from the proposed obliga-	
tion of FY 1973 funds for costs to be incurred	
in FY 1974. Normally, obligations for personal	
services such as those performed by	25X6
are recorded as the services are performed.	23/10
Contracts for such services which span two fiscal	
years usually should evidence an obligation of	
runds for performance through the end of the first	
fiscal year and be made dependent upon the avail-	
ability of funds for continued performance beyond	
that date. See 35 Comp. Gen. 319 (1955). Exceptions	
to this norm generally require statutory authoriza-	
tion. Cf. sec. 707 of Department of Defense	
Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1973, Pub. L.	
92-570. Whether the circumstances in this case	
justify the obligation of current fiscal year	
funds for services to be rendered as much as six	
months hence would require careful study of the	
relevant agreements, an exploration of past DOD	
statutory authority and administrative practice,	
and an examination of pertinent decisions of	
the Comptroller General. However, because of	
the more fundamental legal objection occasioned	
by the departure of further	25X6
examination of this secondary issue would not seem	23/10

SECRET

warranted at this time.

SECRET

3

during which payment could be said to be directly related to past services in Laos, would be extremely difficult to defend. Unless we were to rely on the which we

do not recommend, we would have nothing on which to build a legal defense except the above-described assurances of the Department of Defense General Counsel. We recognize that the burden of defending any interpretation of this statute rests primarily with the Department of Defense, but we believe you should be aware of our analysis of the case and our concerns about it.

It is possible that the congressional assurances obtained by Mr. Buzhardt are adequate to avoid later difficulties with Congress or public embarrassment. However, in the absence of reliable written records we must advise great caution in any reliance on these assurances by this Department in considering plans to use FY '73 MASF funds to support a residual

25X6

L/EA:OTJohnson/L/PM:JHMichel:cdj:6/28/73 ext 22287, 20557

Clearance: L - Mr. Aldrich

cc: EA/LC - Mr. Rives
DOD/GC - Mr. Forman

AID/GC - Mr. Morris

25X1A